

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-20 in the application. In a preliminary amendment, the Applicant canceled Claims 1-20 without prejudice or disclaimer and added Claims 21-40. In the present response, the Applicant has amended Claims 21, 23, 28, 30, 34 and 37. No other claims have been amended, added or canceled in the present response. Accordingly, Claims 21-40 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 21-25 and 28-32 under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 21-25 and 28-32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,233,691 to Atkinson. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Atkinson is directed to battery powered computer systems, and more specifically, to circuits and methods for reducing the power consumption of the computer system by reducing the system clock frequency. (*See* column 1, lines 6-9 and the Abstract.) Atkinson does not teach operating a reconfigurable circuit as recited in independent Claims 21 and 28 including: reconfiguring the reconfigurable circuit by altering a power characteristic applied to at least a portion thereof based on a comparison between a determined transition rate of at least one node located within the reconfigurable circuit and a predetermined operating range. Instead, Atkinson teaches monitoring, for example, cache misses and, based thereon, reducing power to the computer system by reducing the frequency of the provided clock signal. (*See* column 4, lines 57-63.) Thus, Atkinson reduces power to a computer system by reducing the frequency of the clock signal but provides no teaching of reconfiguring the computer system by altering a power characteristic applied to at least a portion thereof. Therefore, even assuming the computer system of Atkinson (*i.e.*, a CPU chip) is a reconfigurable circuit as asserted by the Examiner,

Atkinson does not teach reconfiguring a reconfigurable circuit by altering a power characteristic applied to at least a portion thereof based on a comparison between the transition rate and a predetermined operating range as recited in independent Claims 21 and 28.

Since Atkinson does not disclose each and every element of independent Claims 21 and 28, Atkinson does not anticipate independent Claims 21 and 28 and Claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §102 rejection with respect to Claims 21-25 and 28-32 and allow issuance thereof.

Additionally, the Applicant specifically addresses amended dependent Claims 23 and 30. Atkinson provides no teaching that altering a power characteristic includes removing power to the at least a portion of the reconfigurable circuit, applying power to the at least a portion of the reconfigurable circuit, enabling the at least a portion of the reconfigurable circuit or disabling the at least a portion of the reconfigurable circuit. Instead, Atkinson changes the frequency of the provided clock signal. Thus, Atkinson also does not teach the additional elements of dependent Claims 23 and 30.

II. Rejection of Claims 26-27 and 33-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 26-27 and 33-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkinson. As discussed above, Atkinson does not teach reconfiguring a reconfigurable circuit by altering a power characteristic applied to at least a portion thereof based on a comparison between a transition rate and a predetermined operating range as recited in independent Claims 21 and 28. Additionally, Atkinson does not suggest reconfiguring a reconfigurable circuit by altering a power characteristic applied to at least a portion thereof based on a comparison between a transition rate and a predetermined operating range as recited

in independent Claims 21 and 28. Instead, Atkinson teaches changing power consumption by changing pre-defined frequencies of a clock signal from an oscillator based on changing bits in a register. (*See* column 4, lines 19-50 and column 7, lines 2-10.) Thus, Atkinson neither teaches nor suggests each and every element of Claims 26-27 and 33 that depend on independent Claims 21 and 28, respectively.

Additionally, Atkinson does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claim 34 which also includes reconfiguring a reconfigurable circuit by altering a power characteristic applied to at least a portion thereof based on a comparison between a transition rate and a predetermined operating range as recited in independent Claims 21 and 28. Atkinson, therefore, fails to teach or suggest the invention recited in independent Claims 21, 28 and 34 and Claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, Claims 26-27 and 33-40 are not obvious in view of Atkinson and the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the §103 rejection of Claims 26-27 and 33-40 and allow issuance thereof.


III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 21-40.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Joel Justiss", with a stylized, flowing script.

J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: 9/18/05

Hitt Gaines, P.C.
P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083-2570